UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,469	04/23/2001	Rodger Williams	2400-667	1931

			EXAMINER
27820	7590	06/16/2004	SHAPIRO, JEFFERY A

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 1287
CARY, NC 27512

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3653	

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/840,469	WILLIAMS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeffrey A. Shapiro	3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 March 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,4-9,11-21 and 28-33</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,4-9,11-21 and 28-33</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1, 4-9, 11-21, and 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Suzuki (US 6,344,836 B1) in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary,

3rd Edition, further view of Coutts et al (US 2002/0099634 A1), still further in view of

Bates et al (US 2001/0044843 A1), still further in view of

http://www.robertgraham.com/pubs/hacking-dict.html, still further in view of

http://www.pcwebopaedia.com/TERM/P/port.html, and still further in view of

http://www.pcwebopaedia.com/quick_ref/portnumbers.asp, and still further in view of

Grasso (US 5,892,909).

Suzuki discloses the following.

As described in Claims 1, 13, 14 and 20;

1.   a plurality of displays (20 and 30) with associated input devices;

(see fig. 1, and col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-2, which illustrate and

describe a keyboard/mouse controller, fig. 3, which illustrates a display

with a touch panel (30 and 34) and fig. 4, which illustrates a remote

controller (50).)

2.   a display controller (15) associated with said plurality of displays,

said display controller comprising as follows;

    a.   communication electronics (see col. 5, lines 20-26) for

communicating with a server (note that the mention of the term

"internet" implies that a server is connected or that a server may be

contacted) running a control application (note the mention of the

term "browser" in col. 1, lines 60-64, which implies use of a control

application from a server to view html documents obtained by

internet protocol (IP) addressing techniques—see Microsoft

Computer Dictionary, 3rd Edition, dated 1997, p.505); See also

Grasso, which states in col. 2, lines 12-24, that the internet works

by using an IP address directed by a port to a particular application

or process.

    b.   a control system associated with said communication

electronics and adapted to;

        i.   run browser applications for each of said plurality of

displays (again, note that each display is shown to have an

individual user input, either through a keyboard or a touch

screen, as discussed above);

        ii.   receive input from each of said input devices and

provide the input to the control application (see col. 1, lines

60-67 and col. 2, lines 1-9 and 40-67, noting that a typical

internet access device requires user input through a

keyboard or touch-screen, as is well-known in the art);

 iii. receive instructions for said browser applications from

the control application; (note that it is obvious to one

ordinarily skilled in the art that the browser application as

described in col. 1, lines 60-64, for example, works in such a

manner. See, for example, Coutts et al, (US 2002/0099634

A1), which describes a browser application receiving

instructions from a control application using TCP/IP protocol

in paragraphs 134 and 135. Also, see Grasso, as cited

previously.)

As described in Claims 4 and 28;

 3. said displays are mounted in a kiosk;

 3a. said plurality of displays and said display controllers are associated

with a kiosk; (see Coutts et al, noting that a kiosk can be construed to be

any point of sale stand alone installation (see Coutts, abstract, for

example), which is also suggested by Suzuki at col. 2, lines 53-67, which

describes using multiple displays in department stores, for example.)

As described in Claims 5, 16 and 29;

 4. a server remote from said display controller and adapted to run said

control application (note again, that Suzuki mentions use of an internet

browser at col. 5, lines 20-26, which suggests the use of a remote server);

As described in Claims 6, 16 and 30;

> 5.   said server is further adapted to run a web server application configured to provide content to the browser applications of the display controller (again, see Suzuki, col. 5, lines 20-26);

As described in Claims 7, 17 and 31;

> 6.   said control application is adapted to process the input and provide certain of the instructions for a corresponding one of the browser applications; (Note that this is how internet based programs are known to function—see Coutts, paragraphs 134, 135, 327, 347, 352 and 410. Note also Bates (US 2001/0044843 A1), Claim 7;)

As described in Claims 8, 18 and 21;

> 7.   said control application is adapted to provide certain of the instructions for a corresponding one of the browser applications based on events or instructions unrelated to the input (see again Bates, discussed previously);

As described in Claims 9, 15 and 32;

> 8.   for each of said browser applications, said control system is further adapted to provide a request for content from a web server based on the instructions;

> 9.   receive content in response to the request;

> 10.   display content on a corresponding one of said plurality of displays;

(Note again, that this is how the internet works, as is known to those ordinary

skilled in the art. See previous discussion.)

As described in Claim 13;

>   14.   said communication electronics are wireless communications
>
>   electronics adapted to provide wireless communications with the server;
>
>   (See Coutts, paragraph 0327.)

As described in Claim 19;

>   15.   effecting control of a peripheral at the first location with instructions
>
>   from the second location; (See again Coutts, paragraphs 134, 135, 327,
>
>   347, 352 and 410, as well as also Bates (US 2001/0044843 A1), Claim 7.)

As described in Claims 1, 13, 14 and 20;

>   11.   said display controller is assigned one Internet Protocol (IP)
>
>   address and each of the browser applications is assigned a unique port
>
>   associated with the IP address; (See Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 3rd
>
>   Edition, dated 1997, p.374, which defines the term "port number", as an
>
>   address that directs IP packets to a particular "process". A "process" is
>
>   defined on p. 383 as a "program" or "manipulating data with a program."
>
>   See also http://www.robertgraham.com/pubs/hacking-dict.html, copyright
>
>   1998-2001, entry for the term "port", on p. 138, 139 which describes a port
>
>   as an internet address that "tells which program is to receive the data."
>
>   See also http://www.pcwebopaedia.com/TERM/P/port.html, entry number

2, which states that a port, under TCP/IP and UDP networks, indicates "an

endpoint to a logical connection." See also

http://www.pcwebopaedia.com/quick_ref/portnumbers.asp, which lists

common port numbers. Again, note Grasso, described above.)

As described in Claim 11;

> 12.   said input devices include keys on at least one of said plurality of
>
> displays (see previous discussion of Suzuki, which describes use of a
>
> touch screen and keyboard in figures 3 and 4);

As described in Claim 12;

> 13.   said input devices include touch screen configuration for at least
>
> one of said plurality of displays (see Suzuki, fig 3);

As described in Claim 33;

> 15a.   said input devices includes keys on at least one of said plurality of
>
> displays (see Suzuki, fig. 3);

Suzuki; the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 3rd Edition; Coutts et al (US

2002/0099634 A1); Bates et al (US 2001/0044843 A1); Grasso;

http://www.robertgraham.com/pubs/hacking-dict.html;

http://www.pcwebopaedia.com/TERM/P/port.html, and

http://www.pcwebopaedia.com/quick_ref/portnumbers.asp are all considered to be

analogous art.   Suzuki concerns a multiple display system with user inputs for each

display, all controlled by a single display controller, and used for internet browsing.

Coutts and Bates each concern a multiple display system with further details on the

internet connection implied by Suzuki. The Microsoft computer Dictionary and the

URL's regarding webopaedia and the hacking dictionary reflect dictionary terms

concerning the state of the art at the time of the invention in internet protocol

terminology, reflecting what one ordinarily skilled in the art would understand such

terms to be. Grasso relates the historical background of the internet and how internet

addressing works, noting that it is well-known by those ordinarily skilled in the art as a

common carrier, much like the POTS (plain old telephone system).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to have used the system

of Suzuki to control several of displays simultaneously with one control driver circuit,

each individual display separately operated by a separate user to browse the internet

and access information in standard html format using appropriate URL's and port

addresses.

The suggestion/motivation would have been because, as discussed above,

Suzuki mentions using the displays for browsing the internet, which suggests to one

ordinarily skilled in the art that tcp/ip address techniques are used. See Suzuki, col. 7,

lines 40-48 and lines 57 -59. The prior art cited above, further describes such

information in further detail, constituting proof of what one ordinarily skilled in the art

would be expected to know is, at the very least, implied by the terms "browser" and

"internet". The standard way of using the internet to obtain information is by use of an

internet browser, through which a TCP/IP (or URL) address is sent which tells what

remote computer on which to find the information. The URL address must have a port

address attached to it which tells where the contacted computer is to send the

information. This is standard and well-known practice in current internet browser

technology, as further buttressed by Grasso, cited above.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the system of Suzuki to obtain the

invention as described in Claims 1, 4-9, 11-21, and 28-33.

Response to Amendment

3.   The declaration filed on 3/4/04 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the

Smith reference (US 6,619,543 B1).

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1, 4-9, 11-21, and 28-33 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Kolls (US 6,643,623 B1) discloses a method of internet

communication using an internet browser at a fuel dispenser. See col. 16, lines 14-35,

col. 18, lines 4-16 and 29-67, col. 19, lines 1-14 and col. 25, lines 19-30, col. 32, lines

30-62, and col. 35, lines 4-16. Landsman et al (US 6,317,761 B1) discloses a browser

based advertising system for use through a web browser.

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jeffrey A. Shapiro whose telephone number is

(703)308-3423. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 AM-

5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Donald P. Walsh can be reached on (703)306-4173. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeffrey A. Shapiro
Examiner
Art Unit 3653

May 29, 2004

DONALD P. WALSH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600